



*TFM*

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTY.'S DOCKET: PIPKO=2

In re Application of:	)	Confirmation No.: 4845
	)	
Gregory PIPKO et al	)	Art Unit: 1655
	)	
I.A. Filing Date: 09/01/2003	)	Examiner: Amy Lynn Clark
371(c) Date: October 19, 2004	)	
	)	December 15, 2006
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/511,755	)	
	)	
For: FUNGICIDE COMPOSITION	)	
CONTAINING TEA TREE OIL	)	

COMMUNICATION

Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment  
Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

As required by the last paragraph of the examiner's  
"Interview Summary" mailed December 1, 2006, applicants  
confirm the comments of the examiner in such "Interview  
Summary".


The telephone conference was very brief, undersigned  
(on behalf of applicants) merely asking the examiner if she  
had had time to consider the Reply, and then asking what the  
examiner intended to do.

Applicants filed an RCE on Monday, November 27, 2006, and applicants now await the results of further examination.

(For the record, applicants would request the examiner not to use form PTOL-413 for such a telephonic interview of no substance, as that form requires an applicant to file a communication, which is simply a waste of time and effort in such a situation, and is entirely unnecessary. It is believed that there is another Interview Summary form which should be used in such a situation; alternatively, it is believed that if PTO L-413 is used instead, the examiner should X-out the last paragraph so as not to require a needless and useless paper from the applicant.)

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By   
Sheridan Neimark  
Registration No. 20,520

SN:kg  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\B\Bres\Pipko2\2006-12-15 PCTCOMMUNICATION.doc